arXiv:1702.00465v2 [math.AP] 27 Apr 2017

A GEOMETRIC APPROACH TO REGULARITY FOR NONLINEAR FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

ARAM L. KARAKHANYAN

Abstract. Let u be a weak solutions of the free boundary problem $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \partial_{\rm red}\{u>0\}, u \geq 0$ where $\mathscr{L}u = \operatorname{div}(g(\nabla u)\nabla u)$ and $g(\xi)$ is a given function of ξ satisfying some standard structural conditions. We prove that the free boundary of the weak solutions is continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The full regularity of the free boundary is not fully understood even for the *minimizers* in the simplest case $g(\xi) = |\xi|^{p-2}, p > 1$, partly because the methods from the classical case $p = 2$ cannot be generalized to the full range of p. Our method is very geometric and works even for the *stationary points* of the functionals $\int_\Omega F(\nabla u) + Q^2 \chi_{\{u>0\}}$ with F satisfying some standard structural conditions.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the weak solutions of the free boundary problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{L}u = 0 & \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ |\nabla u| = \ell & \text{on } \partial\{u>0\} \cap B_r(x_0) \\ u \geq 0 & \text{in } B_r(x_0), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

in the ball $B_r(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - x_0| < r\}$ where $\mathscr{L}u = \operatorname{div}(\rho(\nabla u)\nabla u)$ is a quasilinear elliptic operator with $\rho(\xi), \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ subject to some standard structural conditions and, ℓ is the free boundary constant. The solutions of (1.1) can be seen as stationary points of the functional

$$J[u] = \int_\Omega F(|\nabla u|) + Q^2 \chi_{\{u>0\}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{A} = \{v \in W^{1,F}(\Omega), v - u_0 \in W^{1,F}(\Omega)\} \tag{1.2}$$

where $W^{1,F}(\Omega)$ is the Orlicz-Sobolev space of function defined on a Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $u_0 \in W^{1,F}(\Omega)$ is a given boundary condition, χ_D is the characterisitic function of a set D, and ℓ is determined from the implicit relation

$$F'(\ell)\ell - F(\ell) = Q^2.$$

One can write (1.1) in a more concise form

$$\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \partial_{\rm red}\{u>0\} \tag{1.3}$$

where $\partial_{\rm red}\{u>0\}$ is the reduced boundary of the set $\{u>0\}$, $\mathcal{H}^s$ is the $s-$dimensional Hausdorff measure, and $\lambda_0 = F'(\ell)$. Note that the latter relation can be used to recover the free boundary condition $|\nabla u| = \ell$

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35R35, 35B25.

Keywords: Free boundary regularity, global solutions.

from the equation $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$. We give the precise definition below, which is valid in $\mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 2$.

Definition 1.1. *A function u is said to be a weak solution of $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$, if the following is satisfied:*

1) *$u \in W^{1,F}(\Omega)$ is continuous and non-negative in Ω and $\mathscr{L}u = 0$ in $\{u > 0\}$,*
2) *for $D \Subset \Omega$ there are constants $0 < c_{\min} \leq C_{\max}$ such that for the balls $B_r(x) \subset \Omega$ with $x \in \partial\{u > 0\}$*

$$c_{\min} \leq \frac{1}{r^n} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} u \leq C_{\max},$$

3) *$\{u > 0\}$ is a set of finite perimeter and $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ in the following sense: for test function $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ the equality*

$$-\int_\Omega \rho(\nabla u)\nabla u \nabla \zeta = \lambda_0 \int_{\partial_{\rm red}\{u>0\}} \zeta d\mathcal{H}^{n-1},$$

holds. $\partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ is the reduced boundary of $\{u > 0\}$, see 4.5.5. [5] for definition.

Remark 1.1. *In [7] "flatness implies regularity" type result is proven for weak solutions. If $x_0 \in \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ then the free boundary near x_0 is a smooth surface. Hence the free boundary condition $|\nabla u| = \ell$ is satisfied in the classical sense. Furthermore, the weak solutions enjoy the following properties;*

1° *$\partial\{u > 0\}$ is of locally finite perimeter and $\partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ is open relative $\partial\{u > 0\}$,*
2° *$\partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ is smooth, and $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\{u > 0\} \setminus \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}) = 0$.*
3° *the gradient is upper-semicontinuous, i.e.*

$$\limsup_{\substack{x \to x_0, \\ x \in \{u>0\}}} |\nabla u(x)| = \ell.$$

Our first result states that the free boundaries of weak solutions are smooth $\mathbb{R}^2$. To elucidate the our method we first choose to formulate the result for $\mathscr{L}u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathscr{L} = \Delta_p$ be the $p-$laplacian, i.e. $\rho(\xi) = |\xi|^{p-2}, F(\xi) = |\xi|^p, 1 < p < \infty$ and u be a weak solution of (1.1) in B_1, the unit ball centered at the origin, in the sense of Definition 1.1. Suppose that there is a constant $\theta > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{|\{u = 0\} \cap B_r(x)|}{|B_r(x)|} \geq \theta > 0, \qquad \forall B_r(x) \subset B_1, x \in \partial\{u > 0\} \cap B_1. \tag{1.4}$$

Then $\partial\{u > 0\}$ is a continuously differentiable curve in B_1.

The proof is a combination of two lemmas to follow. In the first one we show that any component of $\partial\{u > 0\}$ with positive $\mathcal{H}^1$ measure must be smooth.

Lemma 1.3. *Let u be as in Theorem 1.2 and $\gamma \subset \partial\{u > 0\}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma) > 0$. Then γ is smooth.*

Proof. We employ a compactness argument and show that the blow-up limit u_0 exists and u_0 is a weak solution thanks to condition (1.4). Consider $u_k(x) = \frac{u(x_0 + r_k x)}{r_k}$ for some positive sequence $r_k \downarrow 0$ with $x_0 \in \gamma \subset \partial\{u > 0\}$. Because of the Lipschitz continuity of u [4, 3], it follows that $\{u_k\}$ is locally Lipschitz.

By a customary compactness argument there exists a subsequence $\{u_k\}$ converging to a limit $u_0 \in W^{1,\infty}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$u_k \to u_0 \qquad \text{strongly in } W^{1,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ and } C^{\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^n), \forall \alpha \in (0,1) \text{ as } k \to \infty, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\partial\{u_k > 0\} \to \partial\{u_0 > 0\} \qquad \text{in Hausdorff distance } d_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ locally in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\chi_{\{u_k>0\}} \to \chi_{\{u_0>0\}} \qquad \text{in } L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{1.7}$$

For the proofs of (1.5)-(1.7) we refer the reader to [4], [7].

Let u_0 be a blow-up of u at $x_0 \in \gamma$, then by Proposition 3.1 (see Appendix) u_0 is a weak solution. Therefore, we have from Remark 1.1 $|\nabla u_0| = \ell$ on $\partial_{\rm red}\{u_0 > 0\}$ and $|\nabla u_0(x)| \leq \ell, x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $S \subset \partial_{\rm red}\{u_0 > 0\}$ a smooth connected curve and $S' \subset \{u_0 > 0\}$ be a smooth perturbation of S such that S and S' have the same endpoints. Consider the domain $D \subset \{u_0 > 0\}$ bounded by S and S', i.e. $\partial D = S \cup S'$. We have

$$0 = \int_D \mathscr{L} u_0 = \int_S \rho(\nabla u_0)(\nabla u_0 \cdot \nu) + \int_{S'} \rho(\nabla u_0)(\nabla u_0 \cdot \nu) \tag{1.8}$$

$$= -\rho(\ell)\ell\mathcal{H}^1(S) + \int_{S'} \rho(\nabla u_0)(\nabla u_0 \cdot \nu). \tag{1.9}$$

From here utilizing the estimate $|\nabla u_0(x)| \leq \ell, x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (see Remark 1.1 **3**°) we infer

$$\mathcal{H}^1(S) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(S'). \tag{1.10}$$

Since S is smooth we can locally paramatrize it as $x_2 = h(x_1)$ for suitable choice of coordinates x_1, x_2. Consider the one-sided variations of the arc-length by taking $t > 0$, small and $0 \leq \psi \in C^{\infty}_0(S)$. Then from (1.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \frac{1}{t}\int_S [\sqrt{1+(h')^2} - \sqrt{1+(h'-t\psi')^2}] = \\ &= \int_S \frac{2h'\psi' - t(\psi')^2}{\sqrt{1+(h')^2} + \sqrt{1+(h'-t\psi')^2}} \to \quad \text{as } t \to 0 \\ &\to \int_S \frac{h'\psi'}{\sqrt{1+(h')^2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

Therefore $\frac{d}{dx_1}\left(\frac{h'}{\sqrt{1+(h')^2}}\right) \geq 0$. Consequently, the outer curvature $\kappa(S) \geq 0$, i.e. S is convex when regarding S as a local graph from $\{u_0 > 0\}$. Since u_0 is a weak solution then it follows that $\partial\{u_0 > 0\} \cap B_1$ is rectifiable and therefore $\partial\{u_0 > 0\} \cap B_1 = \gamma_0 \cup (\cup_{k=1}^{\infty}\gamma_k)$ such that $\gamma_k, k \geq 1$ are differentiable curves and $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_0) = 0$. Moreover, by (1.10) $\gamma_k, k \geq 1$ are convex from $\{u_0 > 0\}$. For some fixed k_0 let $y_0 \in \partial\gamma_{k_0}$, the relative boundary of γ_{k_0}. Observe that γ_{k_0} is convex so there is one sided sub-differential at y_0 (from the regular side of γ_{k_0}). If we blow-up u_0 at y_0, then u_{00} is again a weak solution thanks to Proposition 3.1. Moreover, at $0 \in \partial\{u_{00} > 0\}$, the free boundary contains a line on which $|\nabla u_{00}| = \ell$. Without loss of generality (because $\rho(\xi)$ is rotation invariant) we may assume that the positive semiaxis $x_1 > 0$ is a subset of the free boundary $\partial\{u_{00} > 0\}$ and $\mathscr{L} u_{00} = 0$ in $\{u_{00} > 0\}$. Continuing u_{00} linearly across the positive semiaxis $x_1 > 0$ and letting

$$\widetilde{u}_{00}(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} u_{00}(x_1, x_2) & \text{if } x_1 \geq 0 \\ \ell x_1 & \text{if } x_1 < 0 \end{cases}$$

we see that $\mathscr{L}\widetilde{u}_{00} = 0$ in some neighborhood of $x_1 = 0$. Applying the unique continuation property of $\mathscr{L}$ [6] we infer that $u_{00}(x_1, x_2) = \ell x_1^+$. This implies that u_0 is flat at y_0 and the relative boundary of the convex arc γ_{k_0} is empty. In other words, $\partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ is a smooth, convex, and complete curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$. This yields that u is flat at x_0. Indeed, since $\partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ is smooth then at $0 \in \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ we can take $\rho > 0$, small, such that

$$\partial\{u_0 > 0\} \cap B_\rho \subset \left\{ -\frac{\bar{\sigma}_0 \rho}{2} < x \cdot e < \frac{\bar{\sigma}_0 \rho}{2} \right\} \cap B_\rho$$

where e is the normal of $\partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ at 0 and $\bar{\sigma}_0$ is the critical flatness constant, see Theorem 9.3 [7]. In other words, u_0 belongs to the flatness class $F\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_0}{2}, 1; \infty\right)$ in e direction. Choose a sequence $r_k \to 0$ as above such that $u_k(x) = \frac{u(x_0 + r_k x)}{r_k} \to u_0(x)$ and (1.5)-(1.7) hold. In particular from (1.6) it follows that

$$\partial\{u_k > 0\} \cap B_\rho \subset \left\{ -\frac{3\bar{\sigma}_0 \rho}{4} < x \cdot e < \frac{3\bar{\sigma}_0 \rho}{4} \right\} \cap B_\rho$$

or $u_k \in F\left(\frac{3\bar{\sigma}_0}{4}, 1; \infty\right)$ for sufficiently large k. Applying Theorem 9.3 [7] we get that $B_{\rho/4} \cap \partial\{u_k > 0\}$ is $C^{1,\alpha}$ surface $\alpha > 0$ in e direction. Consequently, pulling back to u and using flatness implies regularity result (Theorem 9.4 [7]) we infer that $\partial\{u > 0\}$ is differentiable at x_0 and hence smooth. □

Next we show that the free boundary of u is non-thinning, i.e. it is not possible to have $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ and disjoint components $\gamma_k \subset \partial\{u > 0\}$ such that $x_0 \notin \gamma_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ but for some sequence $x_k \in \gamma_k$ we have $x_k \to x_0$. Obviously, if $\partial\{u > 0\}$ is thinning then each γ_k must be a closed curve. Moreover, if u_0 is a blow up of u at x_0 then $\partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ is thinning too and by lemma 1.3 each nontrivial component of the free boundary is a closed convex smooth curve. Thus to complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 it remains to establish

Lemma 1.4. *Let $\gamma \subset \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ be a closed convex curve, then $\gamma = \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$.*

Proof. γ must be strictly convex otherwise the argument in the proof of the regularity for the non-thinning case (see Lemma 1.3) implies that γ must be a line. Moreover, γ is C^∞ smooth regular curve. Consequently, there is a ball of radius $\rho > 0$ which rolls freely inside of the convex hull of γ, which we denote by D, i.e. $D = \text{Hull}(\gamma)$. We assume that ρ is the largest radius with this property. Note that $\rho \le (\max \kappa(\gamma))^{-1}$. For every $z \in \gamma$ let $B_\rho(z_0)$ be the ball in D touching γ at z. Denote the "fundamental solution" of $p-$laplacian by $\Phi(r) = r^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}, p \neq 2$, where $r = |x - z_0|$ and let

$$w_z(x) = \begin{cases} \ell \dfrac{\Phi(|x - z_0|) - \Phi(\rho)}{\Phi'(\rho)} & \text{if } \ p > 2, \\ \ell \dfrac{\Phi(\rho) - \Phi(|x - z_0|)}{|\Phi'(\rho)|} & \text{if } \ 1 < p < 2, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

so that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_p w_z(x) = 0 & \text{in } \ \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_\rho(z_0)}, \\ w_z > 0, & \text{in } \ \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B_\rho(z_0)}, \\ |\nabla w_z| = \ell & \text{on } \ \partial B_\rho(z_0). \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

Consider

$$W(x) = \inf_{z \in \gamma} w_z(x) \tag{1.14}$$

then it follows from Perron's method that $\Delta_p W \leq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$ and

$$|\nabla w_z| = \ell \frac{\rho^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{|x-z_0|^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} \to 0 \quad \text{as } |x-z_0| \to \infty. \tag{1.15}$$

Observe that by strong minimum principle it follows that W cannot assume its minimum in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$ hence $W > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$. Let us define

$$\mathbb{W} = \{w : \text{nonnegative } p-\text{superharmonic function on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D \text{ satisfying } w \geq 0, |\nabla w|_\gamma| \geq \ell\}.$$

Since $W \in \mathbb{W}$ then $\mathbb{W} \neq \emptyset$.

Thus by Perron's method it follows that there is a function U such that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_p U(x) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D, \\ U > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D, \\ |\nabla U| = \ell & \text{on } \gamma. \end{cases} \tag{1.16}$$

Indeed, if $U = \inf_{\mathbb{W}} w$, then by taking $\min(w_z, U)$ one can always achieve smaller slope at $z \in \gamma$ if $|\nabla U(z)| > \ell$ forcing $|\nabla U|_\gamma| = \ell$. (One can also directly start from an appropriate multiple of the $p-$capacitary potential of D with respect to $\mathbb{R}^2$ as a barrier in order to construct U.)

Since near γ Δ_p is uniformly elliptic then by a result from [8] there is a domain $D_0 \subset\subset D$ such that u_0 can be $p-$harmonically continued inside $intD \setminus \overline{D}_0$. Let $\tilde{u}_0$ be the continuation of u_0 such that the function $\hat{u}_0$ defined as

$$\hat{u}_0(x) = \begin{cases} u_0 & \text{if } \ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D, \\ \tilde{u}_0, & \text{if } \ x \in intD \setminus \overline{D}_0 \end{cases} \tag{1.17}$$

is $p-$harmonic across γ and $\nabla \tilde{u} \neq 0$ in $intD \setminus \overline{D}_0$. Similarly,

$$\hat{U}(x) = \begin{cases} U & \text{if } \ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D, \\ \tilde{u}_0, & \text{if } \ x \in intD \setminus \overline{D}_0 \end{cases} \tag{1.18}$$

Since the critical points of $p-$harmonic functions are discrete in $\mathbb{R}^2$ then from the unique continuation theorem [6] it follows that $\hat{U} = \hat{u}_0$, and consequently $u_0 > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D$. □

Remark 1.5. *If u is a minimizer of $J_p[u] = \int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^p + \lambda \chi_{\{u>0\}}$ then u is also a weak solution. If u is a minimizer of J_p then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ let*

$$u_\varepsilon := \max\{u - \varepsilon\zeta, 0\},$$

where $\zeta \in C_0^{0,1}(B_\rho(x_0))$, defined as

$$\zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x-x_0| > \rho, \\ \dfrac{\log(\rho/|x-x_0|)}{\log(\rho/r)} & \text{if } x \in B_\rho(x_0) \setminus B_\rho(x_0), \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B_r(x_0). \end{cases}$$

Then in $\mathbb{R}^2$ the comparison $J_p[u] \leq J_p[u_\varepsilon]$ gives that every blow-up of u must have constant gradient [1], [2]. Clearly, this argument cannot be used if u is a merely a stationary point. Moreover, even for the minimzers, it does not imply that the free boundary is continuously differentiable for the full range $1 < p < 2$, cf [4].

In closing this section we construct a sequence of weak solutions such that the measure theoretic boundary of its limit is empty, cf. [1] 5.8. This example shows that the condition (1.4) is necessary. Let us define

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} x_n - \varepsilon & \text{for } x_n \geq \varepsilon, \\ 0 & \text{for } |x_n| \leq \varepsilon, \\ \varepsilon - x_n & \text{for } x_n \leq -\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then one can check that u is a weak solution for every $\varepsilon > 0$. However, for $\varepsilon = 0$ this is not true. In this case $\Delta_p u = 2\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\llcorner\partial\{u > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\{u > 0\} \setminus \partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}) > 0$ since $\partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\} = \emptyset$, in other words the normal derivative $\partial_\nu u$ cannot be reconstructed from $\ell = \lambda^* = 2$.

2. Generalizations

One can impose various assumptions on ρ to guarantee that the elliptic operator has nice properties. We formulate them in the following three hypotheses:

(H1) $\mathscr{L}$ is a quasilinear elliptic operator such that the strong maximum principle, interior $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity theory, Harnack inequality for non-negative solutions are valid for the weak solutions of $\mathscr{L}u = 0$. Under these conditions it follows that if u is a weak solution of (1.1) then the gradient is upper semicontinuous, i.e.

$$\limsup_{\substack{x\to x_0,\\ x\in\{u>0\}}} |\nabla u(x)| = \ell. \tag{2.1}$$

(H2) The unique continuation for the weak solutions of $\mathscr{L}u = 0$ is valid, i.e. if $\mathscr{L}u = 0$ in Ω and there is subdomain $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ such that u is affine on Ω' then u is affine in Ω.

(H3) The class of weak solutions is closed with respect to blow-up.

If (**H1**)-(**H3**) are valid then one can generalize the variational theory from [1], [2] for a larger class of equations

$$\mathscr{L}u = \operatorname{div}\left(g(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right), \quad \rho(\xi) = \frac{g(|\xi|)}{|\xi|} \tag{2.2}$$

with implicitly given free boundary conditions

$$\Psi(\nabla u) = Q^2$$

where Ψ is determined by g, see [7].

Some examples are as follows:

- The classical Alt-Caffarelli functional $J_{\rm AC}[u] = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + Q^2\chi_{\{u>0\}}$ [1] where $Q(x), x \in \Omega$ is a Hölder continuous function bounded away from zero and infinity.
- The nonlinear version of $J_{\rm AC}$

$$\int_\Omega F(|\nabla u|^2) + Q^2\chi_{\{u>0\}} \tag{2.3}$$

with $c_0 \leq F'(t) \leq C_0, 0 \leq F''(t) \leq C_0(1+t)^{-1}$ [2]. The weak solutions solve $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0\mathcal{H}^1\llcorner\partial_{\rm red}\{u > 0\}$ with implicitly defined free boundary condition

$$\Phi(|\nabla u|^2) = Q^2, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_0 = 2\ell F'(\ell^2), |\nabla u| = \ell, \Phi(s) = 2sF'(s) - F(s). \tag{2.4}$$

- The non-radially symmetric version of J_{ACF}, namely

$$\int_\Omega f(\nabla u) + Q^2 \chi_{\{u>0\}}$$

under the assumtion that $p \cdot \nabla f(p) - f(p)$ is convex [10].

- The analogue of minimiziation problem for the functional J_{ACF} in the Orlicz-Sobolev spaces corresponding to the energy $\int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|) + Q^2 \chi_{\{u>0\}}$ where $\mathscr{L}u = \operatorname{div}\left(g(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right), g(s) = G'(s)$ and the free boundary condition is $|\nabla u| = \ell$ where ℓ is determined from the implicit relation $G'(\ell)\ell - G(\ell) = Q^2$ [7]. The weak equation is $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \partial_{\text{red}}\{u > 0\}$ and $\lambda_0 = g(\ell)$.
- The $p(x)$-Laplacian model and the variable growth functional

$$J_{p(\cdot)}[u] = \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u|^{p(x)}}{p(x)} + Q^2 \chi_{\{u>0\}}, \quad \ell := \left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x)-1} Q^2\right)^{\frac{1}{p(x)}}$$

modelling the stationary flow of electrorheological fluids. In this case the free boundary condition is $\ell := |\nabla u|$ and the differential operator is the $p(x)-$Laplacian $\mathscr{L}u := \Delta_{p(x)} u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p(x)-2}\nabla u)$ with $\lambda_0 = \ell^{p(x)-1}$, for constant case $p(x) = p$ see [4].

In order to formulate the general result it is convenient to introduce the following classes of weak solutions:

Definition 2.1. *We say that $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M)$ if*

(a) $u \in C^{0,1}(B_r(x_0))$ and $\sup_r |\nabla u| \le M$,
(b) $u \ge 0$ and $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$,
(c) u is a weak solution in $B_r(x_0)$.

We say that $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M, \theta)$ if $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M)$ and

$$\frac{|\{u = 0\} \cap B_\rho(x)|}{|B_\rho(x)|} \ge \theta > 0,$$

for any $B_\rho(x) \subset B_r(x_0), x \in \partial\{u > 0\}$.

Note that if $u \in P_r(x_0, M)$ and $u_s(x) = \frac{u(x_0+sx)}{s}$ then $u_s \in \mathcal{P}_{r/s}(0, M)$. Moreover, in view of Proposition 3.1 (see Appendix) if $u \in P_r(x_0, M, \theta)$ and $u_{s_k} \to u_0$ locally uniformly (for some $0 < s_k \downarrow 0$) then $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(0, M, \theta)$. Therefore (**H3**) is valid for $\mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M, \theta)$.

Repeating the proof of Theorem 1.2 we have the following generalization.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $u \in \mathcal{P}_1(x_0, M)$ such that the hypotheses* **(H1)-(H3)** *are satisfied, then the free boundary is continuously differentiable curve.*

3. Appendix

In this section we prove that $\mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M, \theta)$ is closed with respect to the blow-ups. We choose to state the result in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and adapt the proof from [9].

Proposition 3.1. *Let u be a weak solution of $\mathscr{L}u = \lambda_0 \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner \partial\{u > 0\}$ in the sense of Definition 1.1. If $u \in \mathcal{P}_r(x_0, M, \theta)$ such that the blow-up sequence $u_k(x) = \frac{u(x_0+\rho_k x)}{\rho_k}$ converges locally uniformly to u_0, then $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}_R(0, M, \theta)$ for any $R > 0$.*

Proof. Step 1) Let u_0 be a blow-up limit, i.e. let $u_k(x) = \frac{u(x_0+\rho_k x)}{\rho_k}$, $x_0 \in \partial\{u>0\}$ for some sequence $\rho_k \searrow 0, k \to \infty$. Then by a customary compactness argument [7] Lemma 7.1 and Remark 8.2 we can extract a subsequence, still denoted by ρ_k, such that $u_k \to u$ locally uniformly. More precisely, we have that

$$u_k \to u_0 \qquad \text{strongly in } W^{1,F}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } C^{\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n), \forall \alpha \in (0,1) \text{ as } k \to \infty, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\partial\{u_k>0\} \to \partial\{u_0>0\} \qquad \text{in Hausdorff distance } d_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ locally in } \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\chi_{\{u_k>0\}} \to \chi_{\{u_0>0\}} \qquad \text{in } L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3.3}$$

is a weak solution. Consequently, it follows that properties 1) and 2) in Definition 1.1 for u_0 hold true. Furthermore,

$$\frac{|B_r(x)) \cap \{u_0=0\}|}{|B_r(x)|} \geq \theta, \qquad x \in \partial\{u_0>0\}, \qquad B_r(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

To show that u_0 is weak solution it remains to verify the equation 3) in the Definition 1.1. We need to show two things: $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\{u_0>0\} \setminus \partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\}) = 0$ and the smoothness of $\partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\}$ stated in the Remark 1.1 **1°-3°**.

Step 2) Next, we prove that $\{u_0>0\}$ is of finite perimeter. Take $\zeta(x) = \max(0, \min(1, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(R-|x|)))$ in 3) of Definition 1.1 to conclude, after sending ε to zero, that for a.e. $R>0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial_{\text{red}}\{u_k>0\} \cap B_R(0)) &= \rho_k^{n-1}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial_{\text{red}}\{u>0\} \cap B_{R\rho_k}(x_0)) \\
&= \lambda_0 \int_{\partial B_{\rho_k R}(x_0)} g(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|} \cdot \nu \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\
&\leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

From here the claim follows from the semi-continuity of the perimeter.

Since the current boundary $T = \partial(\mathbb{R}^n \llcorner \{u_0>0\} \cap B_R(0))$ is representable by integration, $\|T\| = \int_{B_R(0)} |D\chi_{\{u_0>0\}}|$, we get from 4.5.6. (3) [5] $\partial\{u_0>0\} \setminus \partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\} = K_0 \cup K_+$ where $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(K_+) = 0$ and for $x_1 \in K_0$, $r^{1-n}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\} \cap B_r(x_1)) \to 0$ as $r \to 0$.

Let us show that $K_0 = \emptyset$. For $u_{0k}(x) = \frac{u_0(x_1+r_k x)}{r_k}$, by compactness argument as above, we have $u_{0k} \to u_1$ for another function u_1 and

$$\int_{B_R} \chi_{\{u_1>0\}} \text{div}\phi \longleftarrow \int_{B_R} \chi_{\{u_{0k}>0\}} \text{div}\phi = r_k^{1-n} \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_1)} \chi_{\{u_0>0\}} \text{div}\phi \left(\frac{x-x_1}{r_k}\right).$$

On the other hand

$$\left| r_k^{1-n} \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_1)} \chi_{\{u_0>0\}} \text{div}\phi \left(\frac{x-x_1}{r_k}\right) \right| \leq \sup \phi r_k^{1-n}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\} \cap B_{Rr_k}(x_1)) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Hence we infer that $\chi_{\{u_1>0\}}$ is a function of bounded variation which is constant a.e. in B_R. The positive Lebesgue density property of $\{u_1=0\}$, translated to u_1 through compactness as in step **1)**, and strong maximum principle for the solutions of $\mathscr{L}u = 0$ (see Hypothesis **(H1)**) demands u_1 to be zero. This is in contradiction with 2) in Definition 1.1 since by compactness as in step **1)** the non-degeneracy translates to u_1. Thus $K_0 = \emptyset$ and we obtain $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\{u_0>0\} \setminus \partial_{\text{red}}\{u_0>0\}) = 0$.

To show that $\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\}$ is smooth, we notice that if $z_0\in\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\}$ and $\nu(z_0)$ is the normal at z_0 in the sense of 4.5.5. [5], then by the uniform Lebesgue density of $\{u_0=0\}$ and nondegeneracy of u_0 from 2) of Definition 1.1 we have $u_0\in F(\frac{\sigma}{2},1;\infty)$ in $B_{2\rho}(z_0)$ in direction $e=\nu(z_0)$ for $\sigma\leq\sigma_0$ and $\rho\leq\tau_0\sigma^{\frac{2}{\beta}}$. Here F is the flatness class defined as in [7] definition 9.1.

At this point we don't know if u_0 is a weak solution so we cannot immediately apply the "flatness implies regularity" to u_0. However from (3.2) we conclude that u_k, which is a weak solution, is in $F(\sigma,1;\infty)$ in $B_\rho(z_0)$ in the direction of e for sufficiently large k (this is because $z_0\in\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\}$ and e is the normal at z_0 in measure theoretic sense). Therefore, the surfaces $\partial\{u_k>0\}$ are all graphs of $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions in direction e with uniform bounds so that we get the same property for $\partial\{u_0>0\}$ Thus $\partial\{u_k>0\}$ are C^3 smooth in $B_{\frac{\rho}{4}}(z_0)$ in the direction of e and this translates to $\partial\{u_0>0\}$ in $B_{\frac{\rho}{4}}(z_0)$.

Step 3) Now we can finally show that u_0 satisfies the equation in 3) of Definition 1.1. Take a compactly supported smooth function ζ and fix a $\delta>0$ small. Let $\mathscr{F}_1$ be a finite subcovering of $\operatorname{supp}\zeta\cap(\partial\{u_0>0\}\setminus\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\})$ by balls $B_{t_i}(y_i)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{N'(\delta)}t_i^{n-1}<\delta$, see step **2)**. Then using partial integration we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int g(|\nabla u_0|)\frac{\nabla u_0}{|\nabla u_0|}\nabla\zeta &= \int_{\mathscr{F}_1} g(|\nabla u_0|)\frac{\nabla u_0}{|\nabla u_0|}\nabla\zeta+\int_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta\setminus\mathscr{F}_1} g(|\nabla u_0|)\frac{\nabla u_0}{|\nabla u_0|}\nabla\zeta\\ &= \int_{\mathscr{F}_1} g(|\nabla u_0|)\frac{\nabla u_0}{|\nabla u_0|}\nabla\zeta-\int_{\operatorname{supp}\zeta\setminus\mathscr{F}_1\cap\{u_0>0\}}\zeta\mathscr{L}u_0+\int_{\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\}\setminus\mathscr{F}_1}\zeta\frac{g(|\nabla u_0|)}{|\nabla u_0|}\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial\nu}\\ &= o_\delta(1)-g(\ell)\int_{\partial(\operatorname{supp}\zeta\setminus\mathscr{F}_1)}\zeta=o_\delta(1)-\lambda_0\int_{\partial(\operatorname{supp}\zeta\setminus\mathscr{F}_1)}\zeta.\end{aligned}$$

To get the last line we used the definition of $\lambda_0=g(\ell)$ and that by step **2)** $\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u_0>0\}$ is smooth, hence, the free boundary condition $|\nabla u_0|=\ell$ holds in the classical sense. Sending $\delta\to0$ we conclude that u_0 is a weak solution. □

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the referee for useful comment on the proof of Theorem 1.2.

References

[1] H.W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli: Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary, Journal für die Reine und Ange. Math. **325** (1981), 105-144.

[2] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman: A free boundary problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* (4) **11** (1984), no. 1, 1–44.

[3] J. Bonder, S.Martínez, N. Wolanski: A free boundary problem for the $p(x)-$Laplacian, Nonlinear Anal. 72 (2010), no. 2, 1078–1103.

[4] D. Danielli, A. Petrosyan: Full regularity of the free boundary in a Bernoulli-type problem in two dimensions, Math. Res. Lett. 13 (2006), no. 4, 667681.

[5] H. Federer: Geometric measue theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg and New York, 1969.

[6] S. Granlund, N. Marola: On the problem of unique continuation for the p-Laplace equation. *Nonlinear Anal.* **101** (2014), 89–97.

[7] S.Martínez, N. Wolanski: A minimum problem with free boundary in Orlicz spaces. Adv. Math. 218 (2008), no. 6, 1914–1971.

[8] F. Müller: On the continuation of solutions for elliptic equations in two variables, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis,**19**, Issue 6, (2002), 745–776

[9] G.S. Weiss: Partial regularity for weak solutions of an elliptic free boundary problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 23 (1998), no. 3-4, 439–455.

[10] G.S. Weiss: A free boundary problem for non-radial-symmetric quasi-linear elliptic equations. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. 5 (1995), no. 2, 497–555.

School of Mathematics, The University of Edinburgh, Peter Tait Guthrie Road, EH9 3FD, Edinburgh, UK
E-mail address: aram6k@gmail.com